

IN THE DRAWINGS

Replacement sheets amending Figs. 9A and 9B are filed herewith. The attached replacement sheets together replace sheet 10 of 12 of the originally filed drawings, breaking up original Fig. 9 into two figures. Figs. 9A and 9B have been amended to enlarge the text for ease in reading and are believed to be in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). Corresponding amendments have been made to the written specification of the application.

REMARKS

This is responsive to the Office Action of June 26, 2007. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to a computer-based system for presenting a user with a comprehensive set of security features for a security document, for assisting the user through any potential incompatibilities associated with selected security features, for selecting a combination of security features for a security document, and for determining a document security rating for the document. Examples of such security features used on a security document include, but are not limited to, pantographs, screens, tamper protection, flourishes, overt authentication, and covert authentication. The system displays a selection guide for the simple selection of desired security features for the design of a security document. After selection, the programmable computer examines those selected security features for possible incompatibilities and presents any potential problems to the user with a description of the concern. Additionally, the software application provides to the user with a recommended course of action to resolve the concern. Finally, the system provides the user with an assessment of how well the selected security features will address the desired goal of the user for the level of security.

Claims 1 - 7, 11, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,957,193, issued Oct. 18, 2005 to Stefik et al. The Stefik patent clearly does not anticipate these claims.

The Stefik patent, the primary reference in this Office Action, discloses a system for controlling the use and distribution of digital works. Digital works are stored electronically at one of a number of repository locations and transmitted to other repositories with usage rights permanently "attached" to the works. The usage rights specify a manner of use and an access specification indicating a security class. The usage rights and any associated fees assigned by a creator and subsequent distributor will always remain with the copies of the works. This permits the creator of a work to

license the use of a work and charge for the use of the work on very specific bases. For example from column 47, line 60 to column 48, line 8, the following example is given:

"A designer of type fonts invests several months in the design of special fonts. The most common way of obtaining revenue for this work is to sell copies of the fonts to publishers for unlimited use over unlimited periods of time. A font designer would like to charge a rate that reflects the amount that the font is used."

"This scenario is performed as follows: the font designer creates a font as a digital work. He creates versions of the Play right that bill either for metered use or "per-use". Each version of the play right would require that the player (a print layout program) be of an approved category. The font designer assigns appropriate fees to exercise the Copy right. When a publisher client wants to use a font, he includes it as input to a layout program, and is billed automatically for its use. In this way, a publisher who makes little use of a font pays less than one who uses it a lot."

It is clear that the Stefik patent deals with safeguarding and restricting access to, and use of, electronic files. There is no suggestion of using security features on documents, nor of assessing the level of security that such security features or that certain combinations of such security features provide.

The claims of the present application are clearly distinguishable from Stefik. These claims have now been amended to highlight the fact that they relate to a system for use with security documents, not with electronic files of some sort, as shown by Stefik. Claim 1 is clarified in this respect by calling for "processing data relating to selected security features of said document," "revising said selected security features of said document to resolve any compatibility issues," "evaluating said relative rating information of said selected security features to determine a document security rating of said document," and "presenting said document security rating of said document." The Examiner indicates that all of these steps are disclosed in the Abstract of Stefik. In point of fact, none of these steps are disclosed in Stefik. Stefik deals with a system for

electronic files ("digital works") in which additional digital data that define "usage rights" are permanently attached to the digital works and govern the use to which the digital works are transmitted electronically from one repository to another. The repositories are assigned security levels and a request from one repository to another will be honored based, at least in part, on whether the requesting repository has the appropriate security level.

Claim 2 calls for "presenting security features for selection." The Examiner points to col. 14, lines 48 - 54 as showing this step. This portion of the Stefik patent does not discuss security features of documents, but rather discloses that the repositories have differing security levels, which are listed in TABLE 2 as levels 0 through 10. Claim 3 states that the security features are "categorized by purpose." Again, the Examiner points to col. 14, this time lines 51 - 54 as showing this step. This portion of the Stefik patent does not discuss security features of documents, let alone categorizing such features by purpose. Rather, this part of Stefik simply discloses that the repositories have differing security levels, which are listed in TABLE 2 as levels 0 through 10. Claims 4 - 7 are all rejected with the Examiner pointing to TABLE 2 in the Stefik patent. Again, TABLE 2 lists the levels of repository security and describes the nature of the repositories that qualify for each level. None of the steps called for in claims 4 - 7 are suggested by TABLE 2. Claims 4, 5, and 7 deal with security features for documents, none of which are shown in TABLE 2, while claim 6 calls for a link for at least one security document type which, when selected, provides an example of the associated security document type. The Stefik patent does not disclose different security document types, let alone links to explanatory materials for the security document types. Claim 11 calls for a "security rating" for a document that "includes a rating of how well said selected security features will protect the security document against different forms of attack and relative ease of authentication of the security document." Nothing like this is taught in the Stefik patent. The Examiner points to col. 31, lines 23 - 26. The cited section of the Stefik patent merely describes how the Stefik system decides whether to permit certain usages of the digital work and how to charge for these usages.

Claim 20 is an independent method claim which specifies the steps by which a document security rating is developed. The claim calls for "processing data relating to selected security features of said document, said security features each having associated compatibility and relative rating information;" "revising said selected security features of said document to resolve any compatibility issues;" "evaluating said relative rating information of said selected security features to determine a document security rating of said document;" and "presenting said document security rating of said document." Note that claim 20 has been amended to clarify that the security features and the security rating all relate to the specific document under consideration. Nothing like this is shown in the Stefik patent. The Examiner refers to several sections of the Stefik patent, but none show documents with security features, let alone the succession of steps in the claims whereby the documents are rated and compatibility of various security features addressed.

Claims 8 - 10, 12 - 14 and 16 - 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Stefik et al in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,143,290, issued Nov. 28, 2006, to Ginter et al, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,885,748, issued April 26, 2005 to Wang. These claims depend either directly or ultimately on independent claim 1 and are patentable over the Stefik patent for the same reasons as presented above in regard to claim 1. The Ginter and Wang patents do nothing to overcome the shortcomings of the Stefik patent as a prior art reference.

The rejection of claim 8 is not understood. The Examiner states that Stefik does not disclose the claimed step (quoting the language of claim 8). The Examiner states that Ginter does not disclose the claimed step (quoting the language of claim 8). The Examiner goes on to state that it would be obvious to combine these two references, neither of which discloses the claimed step, to meet the language of the claim, and the motivation for the combination is convenience and cost effectiveness. This simply is not tenable. Neither reference teaches the claimed step, and there is no suggestion as to how the combination of the references results in the claimed step, let alone an explanation as to why this combination is either cheaper or more convenient (the

motivation for combining the teachings of the references).

Claim 9 is rejected over the combination of Stefik and Ginter, which combination of references is not suggested by the prior art and which combination of references is defective in its teachings, as pointed out above, and further in view of Wang. Wang does nothing to cure the defect in the citation of Stefik and in the combination of Stefik and Ginter.

Claim 10 is rejected over the combination of Stefik and Ginter. Once again, this combination of references is not suggested by the prior art and is defective in its teachings, as pointed out with respect to claim 8. The Examiner states that Ginter does not disclose the step called for in claim 10, but that it would be obvious to combine Stefik and Ginter to meet the language of claim 10. It is submitted that if neither Stefik or Ginter discloses the step of claim 10, the combination of Stefik and Ginter also does not disclose the step of claim 10.

Claim 12 is rejected over the combination of Stefik and Ginter. Once again, this combination of references is not suggested by the prior art and is defective in its teachings, as pointed out with respect to claim 8. The Examiner states that Ginter does not disclose the step called for in claim 12, but that it would be obvious to combine Stefik and Ginter to meet the language of claim 12. It is submitted that if neither Stefik or Ginter discloses the step of claim 10, the combination of Stefik and Ginter also does not disclose the step of claim 12.

Claim 13 is rejected over the combination of Stefik and Ginter and Wang. As pointed out above, the combination of Stefik and Ginter is not tenable. It is submitted, therefore, that claim 13 is not properly rejected over this combination.

Claim 14 is rejected over the combination of Stefik and Ginter. Once again, this combination of references is not suggested by the prior art and is defective in its teachings, as pointed out with respect to claim 8. Claim 14 depends from claim 1.

Claim 1 was rejected as anticipated by Stefik. The Examiner states that Ginter does not disclose providing a warning and suggesting at least two possible solutions for resolving compatibility, but for some reason the combination of Stefik and Ginter render claim 14 obvious. The rejection does not point to the deficiency in the teaching of the basic reference and then how the secondary reference fills this deficiency. Rather, the rejection states that the secondary reference does not show the added limitation of claim 14, but that the secondary reference should nevertheless be added to the primary reference for convenience and cost effectiveness. It is submitted that if neither Stefik or Ginter discloses the step of claim 14, the combination of Stefik and Ginter also does not disclose the step of claim 14.

Claim 16 is rejected over the combination of Stefik and Ginter. The Examiner states that Stefik does not show the claimed step, but that Ginter, at paragraph 72, lines 5-8, does. Applicants simply do not understand this reference to paragraph 72. The Ginter patent does not have numbered paragraphs, only numbered columns, and the numbering of columns ends at column 68. It is submitted, furthermore, that Ginter does not teach the step of presenting a link to common questions and concerns.

The rejection of claim 17 is not understood. The Examiner states that Stefik discloses "said data relating to said selected security features" and that Ginter does not disclose obtaining such data from a database. The Examiner then argues that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Stefik and Ginter "to provide a great need for convenient, cost effective technique to securely handle and deliver documents and other items." Once again, the Examiner states that Ginter does not disclose the claimed step, but it would be obvious to combine these two references, neither of which discloses the claimed step, to meet the language of the claim. This is simply untenable.

Claim 18 is rejected over the combination of Stefik with Ginter. The Examiner refers to paragraph 231, lines 1 - 6 of Ginter. Ginter does not have number paragraphs, and its column number do not go nearly as high as 231. As a consequence, applicants are unclear as to what portion of the Ginter patent the Examiner makes reference.

Claim 19 is rejected over the combination of Stefik and Ginter, and further in view of Wang. As pointed out above with respect to claim 13 from which claim 19 depends, the combination of Stefik and Ginter is untenable, and the addition of Wang to this combination does nothing to cure the basic defect in the ground of rejection. Additionally, since none of the references relates to rating security documents, they cannot in combination suggest taking certain actions if the security rating of the document for a rating is inadequate.

It is submitted that all of the claims currently presented in the instant application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to resolve efficiently any formal matters or to discuss any aspects of the application or of this response. Otherwise, early notification of allowable subject matter is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
DINSMORE & SHOHL L.L.P.

By /James F. Gottman/
James F. Gottman
Registration No. 27,262

One Dayton Centre
One South Main Street, Suite 1300
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2023
Telephone: (937) 449-6400
Facsimile: (937) 449-6405
e-mail: james.gottman@dinslaw.com

JFG/AMM